

An Advisory Action was mailed February 22, 2005, indicating that the Request for Reconsideration did not place the application in condition for allowance.

**Summary of Claim Amendments**

By the foregoing amendments, Applicants have amended Claims 29 and 32-41 to correct minor, typographical, and/or linguistic errors. Specifically, Applicants have amended Claims 29 and 32-41 to read "[a] method according to . . . ." Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

**Rejection of Claims 28-36, 40, and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Over Faisant I and/or Faisant II**

Claims 28-36, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purported anticipated by Faisant I and/or Faisant II. See *Final Official Action mailed October 1, 2004, Pages 3-4*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987); See *M.P.E.P. § 2131*. Applicants respectfully assert that neither Faisant I nor Faisant II contain each and every element of Claims 28-36, 40, and 41, thereby precluding anticipation. In the alternative, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Faisant I nor Faisant II is the work of "another" pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).